

THE ST. LOUIS REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED BY GEORGE KNAPP & CO.
 Charles W. Knapp, President and Gen. Mgr.
 George L. Allen, Vice President.
 W. B. Carr, Secretary.

Office, Corner Seventh and Olive Streets,
 (REPUBLIC BUILDING)

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
 DAILY AND SUNDAY—SEVEN ISSUES A WEEK.

By Mail—In Advance—Postage Paid.
 One Year, \$7.00.
 Six Months, \$4.00.
 Three Months, \$2.00.
 Any three days, except Sunday, one cent.

Sunday, with Magazine, \$2.00.
 Special Mail Edition, Sunday, \$1.00.
 Single Copies, 5 CENTS.

BY CARRIER, ST. LOUIS AND SUBURBS.
 Per week, daily delivery, \$1.00.
 Per week, daily and Sunday delivery, \$1.50.
 In Advance, \$1.00 per week.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

Published Monday and Tuesday—One Year, \$7.00.
 In Advance, \$7.00 per year.

fully and finally declared. In view of a recent decision upon the same issues by the Supreme Court of Illinois, in which a directly contrary view was taken, the Missouri opinion will be read with unusual interest by members of the legal profession throughout the whole country.

Mr. F. W. Lehmann of this city was counsel for The Associated Press and is to be congratulated upon a notable professional success, since every important contention made in his brief was sustained by the court. The decision will take its place among the leading cases, both because of the importance of the particular issues directly passed on and because of the collateral interest arising from the bearing of the case on the general question of monopolies and trusts. It will assist in educating the public to the point of understanding the essential differences which distinguish the unlawful combinations in restraint of trade from the entirely legitimate and wholly lawful business enterprises which violate no specific statutes and contravene no general principles of law.

POLICE SCANDAL.
 It is now for the Grand Jury to gather all the facts of bribery-taking by patrolmen.

There is no excuse which should prevail to prevent the fullest investigation and the punishment of all patrolmen and others who may be found guilty of evil practices. The safety of life and property in St. Louis depends upon adequate police protection through unceasing and honest effort toward the suppression of crime. This police protection is not possible where police officers are in the pay of criminals for the purpose of shielding the latter from justice.

Investigation into all cases of alleged police misconduct is demanded for the same reason that a right Council investigation of the alleged misconduct of the Supply Department is demanded. If St. Louis is to be well governed along the lines of modern municipal government, faithful service in all departments must be insisted upon and faithfulness rebuked and punished. It is fortunate indeed for St. Louis if the public sentiment of its people has now reached that stage where no consideration of party shall prevail to protect wrongdoers in office or to fasten rings and cabals of any sort upon any municipal department.

Therefore is it that if evil conditions are now existing in the Police Department the fact must be made known and the corrective remedy applied. Sanguine St. Louisans see in the near future a reformed St. Louis, well governed, modernized, its affairs in the hands of practical and honest men. They are not disposed to let anything interfere with the attainment of these conditions. They include the Police Department in their demand for a comprehensive good government. Whatever is wrong in that department must be made right—and it is the Grand Jury's duty to discover if anything is wrong.

DECADENT JOURNALISM.
 Just what the Globe-Democrat expects to accomplish by perditionous abuse of Missouri is one of the problems.

It surely cannot expect to convince any section of public opinion that Missouri is decadent, when it ignores most of the essential facts which every section knows.

Its latest tirade is an illustration. Picking out some of the old agricultural counties, it constructs a table to prove that they have not greatly increased in population. These counties are Democratic. Ergo, says the Globe, to be Democratic is to be decadent.

Not a citizen of the United States who has received a common-school education has missed the fact that in all States the old agricultural counties, Democratic or Republican in politics, have increased but slowly in population. The reason has been discussed in legislatures and in the press a thousand times. A rich agricultural district, once well settled, may be well-to-do, educated and comfortable, but cannot increase rapidly in population unless circumstances induce intensive farming—fruit culture, vegetable growing for city markets or something of the sort—or other circumstances create mining developments or induce a movement in manufactures. The tendency of manufactures is to concentrate in or near large seaports or railroad centers. The most striking fact in the census reports of 1880 and 1900 is the rapid increase of cities as compared with the rate in strictly farming communities.

In Missouri the greatest census increase appeared in St. Louis, St. Joseph and Kansas City. This was but part of the law of increase governing the whole country.

If the Globe-Democrat's method of perversion were used reversely as a system of census taking, it would prove that Chicago, New York, St. Louis and Boston were decadent, as all of them showed a high increase in the Democratic vote.

But to the Globe's own figures. In passing it may be worth while to mention a sidelight of the Globe's Annals instinct. It says that The Republic has waited three weeks before answering its first attack on Missouri counties. The Republic completely exposed the fallacy of the Globe-Democrat's figures at once. The task was not difficult. Late The Republic, avoiding the Globe's unfair method of picking scattered counties to support a bad claim, took a section, Southern Missouri, which is called the Gibraltar of Democracy, and proved that as a whole that section had increased largely in population. The Globe replied by saying that there are some Republican counties in that section. Of course. If The Republic had picked only the heavily Democratic counties the case would have been still stronger. Look at this list of Democratic counties in that section:

Butler .. 1,671 .. 1,380 .. 23 .. 6,905
 Dunklin .. 2,771 .. 1,276 .. 1,495 .. 6,621
 Pemiscot .. 1,279 .. 1,215 .. 64 .. 6,160
 Ripley .. 1,439 .. 822 .. 617 .. 4,574
 St. Francois .. 2,767 .. 2,255 .. 512 .. 8,794
 Stoddard .. 1,285 .. 1,180 .. 105 .. 5,742

TOTALS .. 11,234 .. 8,776 .. 4,217 .. 28,086
 Here is a Democratic plurality of 4,317 accompanied by the great population increase of 28,086.

These figures are taken from one of the Globe's own tables. Using the Globe's method, the six counties could be made the text of a discourse on how Democracy insures rapid increase of population. Nobody would be convinced, since Americans are too well taught to

imagine that politics creates population except as it may produce just and honest local government. But the reasoning would be exactly that of the Globe and based on a premise similarly obtained.

The Globe-Democrat would better drop the subject. The more it talks of decadence the more it fixes the term upon its own reputation.

FOR AMERICAN ACTION.
 The United States Senate reaches a final vote on the Hay-Pauncefote treaty on Thursday of this week. It is now somewhat easier to believe that a convention so forgetful of the rights of this Government will be effectively dealt with in the proper American spirit.

Although Lord Pauncefote, the British Ambassador at Washington, succeeded in convincing Secretary of State Hay that Great Britain was the party to dictate what was permissible for the American Government to do in the building of the Nicaragua Canal, the United States Senate is the country hopes, not so complaisant. The point at issue is one of natural right, and there is no reason why this Government should surrender its natural right to build and fortify the Nicaragua Canal as an American canal.

Americans who hold this view are entirely unimpaired by any sentiment of hostility toward Great Britain. The English newspapers now so loudly claiming that the opposition to the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is composed of "American jingoes and Anglophobes" have no warrant for such an embittered assertion. The opponents of the treaty are good Americans, just as English opponents to a treaty sacrificing English rights would be good Englishmen. It is earnestly to be hoped that this truth will be kept in mind, for there is no sane reason why the two kindred nations should get at loggerheads in considering so simple a point of right and wrong.

The United States have a great duty to perform in their action upon the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. They should defeat that remarkable convention by a big and conclusive majority. The necessity for this action arises from the fact that the Hay-Pauncefote treaty threatens to give to Great Britain a controlling voice in a notable American enterprise concerning which England of right has but little occasion to speak.

When matters are sifted down to the basic ideas, where did Great Britain ever acquire a right to consider a Nicaragua Canal built by the United States of special, immediate concern to herself as distinguished from all other Powers?

Should the ship-subsidy bill follow the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in the disapproval of Congress William McKinley would be the most discredited President who ever received the indorsement of a re-election.

A good city official under charges would be pleased with an investigation which would give him a chance to clear himself. Deputy Supply Commissioner Martin, however, applies for a writ of prohibition.

St. Louis's Police Department has set Ziegenhain a good example in the line of purging itself of evil. The example may be followed to advantage in the Supply Department case.

Anybody can without fear of expense offer a reward for information of a single great work of the Ziegenhain administration in which Mayor and Municipal Assembly had a part.

There is one way by which the Meramec River water supply promoters can earn considerable money; that is, they can abandon their project. Money saved is money earned.

It doesn't take a political prophet to foresee that the party which puts up the strongest and cleanest ticket in St. Louis this spring is certain of overwhelming victory at the polls.

Republican Congressman Burton of Ohio opposes Mark Hanna's ship-subsidy bill. This means the Dead March for Burton in the distribution of Federal patronage.

Adopting the Meramec River supply scheme would be putting a "water snake" in the city's waterworks with no assurance that other bacteria were eliminated.

That plot to rob the Southern States of congressional representation looks so black at close range that even its Republican projectors seem to be shying away from it.

Democratic members elect of the Missouri House of Representatives should pledge themselves only to support the best and strongest Democrat for Speaker.

American diplomacy of the true old-fashioned American spirit is at last to work for peace in China and the probable salvation of the Flowery Kingdom.

American taxpayers naturally object to paying a war tax when the administration so untiringly notifies them every few days that there is no war.

Missouri's Annals slanders, the Globe-Democrat is determined to injure her credit if it has to smash the truth into smithereens.

General Buller now seems to be in condition to triumphantly redeem his promise to eat his Christmas dinner in Pretoria.

It's hoarse for the World's Fair—and all St. Louisans who unite in the good work of pushing it along!

None of us relish the thought that we are at the mercy of criminals who have the police in their pay.

Be sure and get in on the final movement to complete the local fund for the World's Fair.

The Sweetest Music.
 If all this world's sweet music
 Should be blended away,
 Our hearts of loneliness afloat,
 Would come because we heard no more
 A child's own voice in song.

We'd miss the grand music,
 But not with grief the same
 As if no more along life's way
 The children, singing, came:
 For God inspires their singing,
 And in each voice there's more
 We hear the songs His angels sing
 Come from a child's sweet throat.
 REPLY BY E. SANDUSKY.



Some of the Cabanne Club Minstrels who will appear in their annual show Friday night.

MISSOURI SUPREME COURT

UPHOLDS ASSOCIATED PRESS.

State's Highest Tribunal Declares It Is Not

a Monopoly—St. Louis Star's

Suit Lost.

REPUBLIC SPECIAL.
 Jefferson City, Mo., Dec. 18.—The Supreme Court of Missouri met in here today, and delivered a number of important opinions. Among them is an opinion handed down by Judge T. A. Sherman, in the case of State ex rel. Star Company vs. the Associated Press. The case was an original proceeding by mandamus to compel the Associated Press to furnish its budget of daily news to the Star Company.

The mandamus, which the court refused to grant, was asked on a number of grounds, chief among which was that the Associated Press was a public utility, and that it was a monopoly. The court held that the Associated Press was not a public utility, and that it was not a monopoly.

The court held that the Associated Press was a voluntary association of newspapers, and that it was not a monopoly. The court held that the Associated Press was not a public utility, and that it was not a monopoly.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility. The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was not a public utility.

The court held that the Associated Press was not a monopoly, and that it was